

REMARKS

1. Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Diaz et al. (US 5812789 A).

5 Response:

Claim 1

In the Office action dated 03/27/2008, Examiner stated that all claimed limitations recited in applicant's claim 1 were anticipated by Diaz. The applicant respectfully disagrees and points out that the teachings of Diaz are misinterpreted by
10 Examiner. Rationale is given as below.

Applicant's claim 1 explicitly defines "a video signal processing system for encoding an encoding bit stream according to characteristics of a decoding bit stream" and "an encoder electrically connected to the storage device for encoding the encoding bit stream according to an encoding scheme of the decoding bit stream".
15 (*emphasis added*) Therefore, the claimed encoder refers to characteristics of a decoding bit stream to generate an encoding bit stream. In other words, the applicant teaches that characteristics of a decoding bit stream (i.e., an encoding scheme of a decoding bit stream) are involved in the generation of an encoding bit stream. The disclosure of Diaz, however, only focuses on sharing a memory interface and a
20 memory between the video and/or audio decompression and/or compression device with a first device (Fig. 2; col. 3, line 67-col. 4, line 11). Upon careful review of the cited Diaz reference, the applicant finds no pertinent description directed to encoding an encoding bit stream according to an encoding scheme (characteristics) of a decoding bit stream. The applicant therefore asserts that the claimed limitation "an
25 encoder electrically connected to the storage device for encoding the encoding bit stream according to an encoding scheme of the decoding bit stream" is by no means anticipated by the teachings of Diaz.

Moreover, applicant's claim 1 further recites:

30 *"the memory bandwidth needed for a third encoding scheme out of the plurality of encoding schemes being greater than the memory bandwidth needed for any other encoding scheme out of the plurality of encoding schemes, the encoder encoding the*

encoding bit stream using one of the plurality of encoding schemes except the third encoding scheme when the encoding scheme of the decoding bit stream is the third encoding scheme”. (emphasis added)

As mentioned above, the claimed encoder refers to characteristics of the decoding bit stream to generate the encoding bit stream. Therefore, the applicant teaches that the claimed encoder encodes the encoding bit stream using an encoding scheme requiring less memory bandwidth when the encoding scheme of the decoding bit stream requires more memory bandwidth. In view of above arguments, as the cited Diaz reference fails to teach encoding an encoding bit stream according to an encoding scheme (characteristics) of a decoding bit stream, the applicant therefore asserts that above-identified feature is not taught by teachings of Diaz. In the Office action dated 03/27/2008, Examiner stated that such features have been taught in col. 3, lines 26-39 of Diaz’ disclosure. However, the applicant respectfully points out that the passage cited by Examiner is directed to operations of a decoder rather than operations of an encoder. Using operations of a prior art decoder to read on operations of the claimed encoder recited in applicant’s claim 1 is incorrect and illogical.

In light of at least above reasons, the applicant contends that claim 1 should be found patentable over the cited prior art and placed in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-9

As claim 1 includes claimed features patentable over the cited prior art and claims 2-9 are dependent upon claim 1, claims 2-9 having further limitations added to claim 1 therefore should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable.

Claim 10

In the Office action dated 03/27/2008, Examiner stated that all the claimed limitations recited in applicant’s claim 10 were anticipated by Diaz. The applicant respectfully disagrees and points out that the teachings of Diaz are misinterpreted by Examiner. Rationale is given as below.

Applicant’s claim 10 explicitly defines “video signal encoding and decoding

method for encoding an encoding bit stream according to characteristics of a decoding bit stream” and “(a) checking an encoding scheme of the decoding bit stream to decide an encoding scheme for encoding the encoding bit stream”.

(emphasis added) Therefore, the claimed method refers to characteristics of a

5 decoding bit stream to generate an encoding bit stream. In other words, the applicant teaches that characteristics of a decoding bit stream (i.e., an encoding scheme of a decoding bit stream) are involved in the generation of an encoding bit stream. In view of above arguments of claim 1, the applicant therefore asserts that such claimed features are by no means anticipated by the teachings of Diaz.

10 Similarly, referring to above arguments of claim 1, the applicant also points out that the claimed limitations “(b) encoding the encoding bit stream using one of the plurality of encoding schemes except a third encoding scheme when the encoding scheme of the decoding bit stream is the third encoding scheme, the memory bandwidth needed for the third encoding scheme being greater than the memory
15 bandwidth needed for any other encoding scheme out of the plurality of encoding schemes” would never be anticipated by teachings of Diaz (col. 3, lines 26-29).

In light of at least above reasons, the applicant contends that claim 10 should be found patentable over the cited prior art and placed in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

20

Claims 11-25

As claim 10 includes claimed features patentable over the cited prior art and claims 11-25 are dependent upon claim 10, claims 11-25 having further limitations added to claim 10 therefore should be allowed if claim 10 is found allowable.

25


2. Conclusion

Based on the above remarks/arguments, the applicant respectfully submits that all of the rejections set forth in the Office action dated 03/07/2008 have been overcome and the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. If a
30 telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned applicant’ representative at the

Appl. No. 10/711,139
Amdt. dated June 05, 2008
Reply to Office action of March 07, 2008

number indicated below.

Sincerely yours,

5 

Date: 06/05/2008

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

10 e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)

15